DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 666 EA 024 348

AUTHOR Lewis, Mary Daly
TITLE Professional Development Schools: Conditions for Readiness.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Laboratory Schools; *Professional Development; *Readiness; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

Professional development schools provide mutual benefit to schools and universities. Because they are a relatively new iteration of the school/university relationship, there is a need for careful documentation and study of their development. This paper describes the beginning stages of a professional development school project that had the dual purpose of restructuring a university teacher education program and developing professional development schools. It took place in the context of a large urban school system that was undergoing major reform. The study examined schools' readiness for becoming professional development school sites. Readiness was determined using an analytic framework developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly-Lewis (1991), which found that schools' readiness for collaborative professional development can be depicted on a development continuum of three school-based factors: staff development, decision making, and leadership and vision. Through interviews and relationship-building activities, data showed the analytic framework to be useful in understanding readiness of schools to enter into a professional development school relationship. Data on the three readiness factors and their characteristics, as well as resources are discussed. (Contains 16 references.) (Author/RR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. D. Lewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED350666

Professional Development Schools: Conditions for Readiness

Mary Daly Lewis

College of Education
Roosevelt University
430 S. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60605

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, April 1992.

EA 024 348

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professional Development Schools: Conditions for Readiness

ABSTRACT

Professional development schools provide mutual benefit to schools and universities. From the vantage of the university, prospective teachers need excellent models in their preservice training to become good teachers. They need ample and sustained opportunities to observe, participate and reflect on the teaching/learning process as early and often as possible in real school situations. At the same time, experienced teachers in public schools need to continue to grow and improve, address problems and maintain dynamism, have opportunities to generate fresh ideas, interact with peers and others with various perspectives, learn from research, participate in research, reflect on practice. Moreover, as experienced teachers work at their own development, they are poised to play a major role in building the profession through working with novices in mutual professional development.

Because professional development schools are a relatively new iteration of the school/university relationship, there is a need for careful documentation and study of their development. This paper describes the beginning stages of a professional development school project which had the dual purpose of restructuring a university teacher education program and developing professional development schools. It took place in the context of a large urban school system which was undergoing major reform. All involved schools were interested in developing a relationship with a university, yet each school had a different idea of what that meant. The study examines schools' *readiness* for becoming professional development school sites.

Readiness was determined using by an analytic framework developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly-Lewis (1991), which found that schools' readiness for collaborative professional development fit on a developmental continuum of three school-based factors: staff development, decision making, leadership and vision. Through interviews and relationship-building activities, data showed the analytic framework to be useful in understanding readiness of schools to enter into a professional development school relationship. Data on the three readiness factors and their characteristics, as well as resources, are discussed.

Professional Development Schools: Conditions for Readiness

The professional development school (PDS) is an idea whose time has come. The concept from the Holmes Group (Tomorrow's Schools, 1990) seeks to invent new institutions that teach and learn for understanding; teach for everybody's children; create a learning community; have continued learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators; and have thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning (six principles of how PDS should organize, Tomorrow's Schools, 1990). The intent of these new institutions is to mutually benefit schools and universities through the professional development of both prospective and experienced teachers. They also provide for a collaboration between schools and university which can lead to higher level teacher education and more realistic research on schools than universities could do alone.

The PDS conceptualization is based on two assumptions. First, prospective teachers need excellent models in their teacher training in order to become good teachers. They need every opportunity to observe, participate and reflect on the teaching/learning process as early and often as possible. Second, experienced teachers in public schools need to continue to grow and improve, address problems and maintain dynamism, have opportunities to generate fresh ideas, interact with each other and educators from various perspectives, learn from research, participate in research, and reflect on their practice. Furthermore, while experienced teachers are working at their own growth, they are poised to play a major role in building the profession through working with novices as they develop their teaching repertoire and become professional educators.

PDS: Learning to be Learner-Centered

The Holmes concept of the professional development school is about learning and the learner. Since Dewey (1938, 1902), we have known that effective instruction begins with the learner, yet by far, the dominant mode of instruction in schools is the teacher-centered lecture

(Johnson, et al., 1988).

When students enroll in college, they have been in schools for over 13,000 hours, many of which have been spent in didactic instruction. The question for teacher education then becomes, how can prospective teachers who have not generally experienced learner-centered instruction themselves, and who are most influenced by the way they were taught, learn to become effective, learner-centered teachers who focus on students?

In order combat overexposure to didactic teaching, prospective teachers need all the good learner-centered examples that can be provided them in their teacher training and into their first year of teaching (Kennedy, 1991; Lieberman, 1986). This means that every course and experience for prospective teachers should include learning by doing, through practice (Yinger, 1986). Thus, university teaching cannot just be the lecture method, but must also include student decision making, experience-based learning, the project method, a variety of grouping strategies--large, small, cooperative groups, peer coaching, and interdisciplinary approaches (Leinhardt, 1992; Johnson et al, 1988).

Experienced teachers in schools, also need all the learner-centered examples that can be provided to them in their ongoing professional development (Fullan, 1990; Joyce, Showers, Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987). This means that teacher development activities can not be "presenter-centered", telling teachers what to do, but need to provide myriad, hands-on, participatory opportunities for teachers to learn by doing, and opportunities for reflection and dialogue (Schon, 1991).

The PDS appears to be a strong model by which preservice teachers' experiences in courses and schools can be mutually reinforcing. At the same time, the PDS has potential for being a catalyst for change, and a professional support to experienced teachers in schools.

PDS and Restructuring Teacher Education

Roosevelt University's effort in creating professional development schools was based on these ideas. It began in late 1990 in Chicago Public Schools (CPS), a school system in the midst

of major reform. The PDS project was part of a larger effort to restructure teacher education in the College of Education. Restructuring included refining the knowledge base from one that *espoused belief* in learner-centered instruction, to one that more systematically *modeled* learner-centered instruction for students' experiences , as well as, in normal courses (Roosevelt University Knowledge Base, 1991). The Roosevelt PDS model was based on the belief that the teacher is the key to change in the classroom, and that in order to develop learner-centered classrooms, most experienced teachers need professional development opportunities and support. Funding for the initial two years was provided by a major local foundation [Note 1].

The first year of the project was evaluated through detailed logs based on observations kept by the PDS Director on all activities, recorded interviews, and the results of relationship building activities with principals, teachers, and university faculty. The following sections describe the initial stages of PDS site selection and the subsequent use of an analytic framework to determine "readiness" of schools to become PDS sites. The concluding section examines policy issues which seek to institutionalize the PDS model by reallocating existing university resources.

Initial Stages: Building Relationships

During the first year, relationships with seven Chicago Public Schools were explored to determine their potential for becoming professional development schools. Two routes were used to initially contact schools. First, four schools were part of Roosevelt University's Educational Partnership which was an arm of the College of Education that provided leadership support for principals, parent and community training, and a variety of professional development programs for teachers. Second, the three other schools were well known to the faculty as a result of preservice teachers being placed in them for classroom experience, and they were schools believed to have interest in a closer relationship with the University.

Presenting the PDS Model to Principals

At meetings of the Educational Partnership, the Professional Development School concept was presented to about fifteen principals. Highlighted were both the mutual benefits and the nature of commitment. For the three schools not part of the Partnership, the presentation was made during a school visit and meeting with the principal.

Characteristics of the PDS model which were described to principals are shown in Figure 1. Central to the model was staff development where teachers get involved in all aspects of figuring out what professional development meant to them individually and to the community of their school, and to novice teachers coming into the profession.

Interviews at the Schools

As a result of the initial presentations, all seven principals invited the PDS Director to visit the school to further discuss the PDS concept with teachers.

The Principal. The first meeting at each school included a lengthy interview with the principal which first provided in depth information about the PDS model, and then, elicited information about the school.

The PDS model (Figure 1) was presented as *a set of ideas that would function best if tailored to the context of the school, i.e., the model was a starting point for a school/university partnership, not a product for the school to buy into.* The interview also focused the nature of the work that would be necessary to create a partnership in which partners shared equal status and benefit.

Second, the interview included an opportunity for the PDS Director to learn about the school from the perspective of the principal. Questions were asked about the history of the school and community, current student and staff characteristics, commitment to reform, status of School Improvement Plan (SIP), relationship with Local School Council (LSC), and Professional Personnel Advisory Committee (PPAC) [these two groups were created as part of the School Reform Act of 1988], and teachers union.

FIGURE 1. **Roosevelt Professional Development School Model**

Benefits to Roosevelt Students in Teacher Education Programs

- Excellent site for pre-student teaching experiences
- Excellent site for student teaching
- Seminars held in schools for both preservice, cooperating teachers and other interested staff
- Potential placement for a teaching position, and first year support

Benefits to Cooperating and Other Interested Teachers

- Opportunity to support, mentor students, student teachers and first year teachers
- Participate in and help design staff development during the year and in university sponsored summer institutes in mentoring, multicultural education, math and science curriculum and instruction, peer coaching, cooperative learning, whole language, the writing process, proposal writing, PPAC development, LSC development, parent education, and other ideas as determined by each school
- Take courses with tuition voucher provided by Roosevelt for credit in any subject at the University
- Extend professional development by becoming guest presenters and adjunct faculty in professional education courses at the University

Benefits to the School Community

- Collaboration on issue identification and developing solutions to practical problems
- Staff development in variety of areas which are determined by school staff
- Teaming university, school faculty, and student teachers to create experiences in the school aimed at increasing the professionalism of teachers
- Fresh energy, talent from student teachers
- Programs at Roosevelt for 7-8 grade students, and high schools students
- Collaboration with Local School Councils and other parent and community groups on School Improvement Plans and leadership development

Benefits to University Faculty

- Collaborative research opportunities to inform classroom practice
- Opportunities to try out curriculum and instruction in real classrooms, thereby testing general teaching and learning principles with particular students

Next, three areas were probed: 1) the nature of staff development activities the school had participated in the past and the type of staff development teachers preferred; 2) a description of planning, resources and decision-making, i.e., who participates and should participate in making plans and making decisions, and how the issues of allocating resources were handled; and, 3) perception of leadership and vision for the school, i.e., did the teachers and principal have a shared vision, and how was leadership developed.

The three areas of questioning were based on an analytic framework developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991) as part of a staff development needs assessment conducted for the Chicago Public Schools. These areas proved to be the most important features of determining school readiness and for providing a basis for initiating the professional development partnership.

The Staff. The interviews with the seven principals led to meetings with the teachers. Principals handled this in a variety of ways: inviting the PDS Director to meet all staff, to meet interested staff with the principal present, or to meet interested staff with the principal not present. That the PDS Director was a former Chicago teacher of many years, was highlighted in the presentations/interviews. This served to provide a credibility to the school-university partnership that perhaps would have developed more slowly had the PDS director only tangential connection to schools.

At these interviews the PDS model was described as it was to the principal, e.g., that the PDS is a set of ideas that function best when tailored to the context of the school, and that a balanced partnership will take work and commitment from both partners. These interviews also focused on elements in the Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991) analytic framework. Interview data from teachers and principals became the preliminary basis for understanding each school.

Activities to Build Relationships

From October to June, thirty-six meetings were held at the seven schools, the content of

which included: 1) many conversations to build relationships with the principal and teachers in order to determine interest, readiness, and willingness to embark upon such an ambitious undertaking; 2) planning and then implementing staff development awareness sessions in mathematics, whole language, the writing process, and cooperative learning; 3) working with staff to determine priority areas in which the school as a whole wished to work in an ongoing way.

Also during this year activities were held at the university which included: 1) principal debriefing and planning meetings; 2) day-long staff development workshops which enabled principals and teachers to meet together to attend awareness sessions on some of leading research-based instruction and curriculum ideas; 3) "perks", e.g., a half-day mentoring workshop (which included the Joffrey Ballet in the afternoon--free tickets from a corporate sponsor); and discounted Les Miserables tickets for up to 30 students per school; 4) participation by a team of teachers from each school in Roosevelt's Summer Institutes.

The observations, interviews, and relationship-building activities generated a great deal of data on each school. An organizing framework for these data was needed which could help determine the chance for each school becoming a successful PDS site. The concept of readiness was arrived at through applying a framework developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991). The earlier development of that framework is described in the next section.

A Framework for Determining Readiness

An analytic framework was developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991) in their study of staff development readiness in Chicago Public Schools. The purpose of the 1991 study, which included interviews of over 300 teachers, principals and central office staff, was to understand how schools perceived their staff development needs, and to determine the most promising approaches for addressing those needs in the context of school reform.

The 1991 interview data were analyzed using the methods from Miles and Huberman (1984), which organized data by source, by school, by type of staff development schools experienced,

and by particular contexts which either enhanced or inhibited particular staff development efforts. Three factors emerged from the 1991 analysis, each with accompanying characteristics. The factors were: 1) the nature of staff development; 2) planning, decision making, and use of resources, 3) and leadership and vision for the school. Data suggested that there is a developmental process school staffs work through in becoming knowledgeable users of staff development for their school, with schools being *high, medium* or *low* on each factor.

Because staff development was a major feature of the Roosevelt PDS model, particularly in getting experienced teachers engaged in working with novices and peers, the analytic framework seemed applicable to assessing a school's readiness for becoming a PDS site.

Readiness for PDS

Readiness was determined to be a key area of examination in PDS development because our experiences with school-university collaborations, as well as, evidence from the literature on implementation of innovations (Fullan, 1990, 1982; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977) have revealed that there are no guarantees for successful implementation. Thus, it was highly desirable to expend energies that would result in successful PDS sites given the limited resources available for the project.

To test the readiness hypothesis, the Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991) framework was applied to determine whether the seven schools had the potential to become successful PDS sites. As was described, data were collected in the context of numerous meetings, many conversations and opportunities to work with school staffs. Data for this study were also analyzed by using the Miles and Huberman techniques that were used in the original 1991 study. Schools were determined *high, medium* or *low* on the three factors based on data from interviews and from behaviors observed during the year of relationship building activities. The Tables which follow represent the three-part framework and are accompanied by a description of characteristics for each factor.

TABLE 1. NATURE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
TEACHER'S ROLE	interactive	active	passive
DURATION	ongoing	intermittent	one-shot
CONTENT & PEDAGOGY	linked	some linkage	unlinked
RELATION TO SIP	linked to SIP	some linkage to SIP	unlinked to SIP
ROLE OF EXPERTS	teachers are experts; outside consultants for specific work	outside experts work with staff	outside experts talk to staff
TEACHER SHARING	teachers share information from courses, conferences, units developed	teachers take courses, attend conferences, do not share	teachers typically do not attend courses or conferences
TEACHER TALK	teaching and learning	possibilities for teaching and learning	no talk of teaching and learning

NATURE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Role of teacher in staff development - In an interactive role, teachers are integrally involved in the conduct of staff development; teachers contribute, even conduct the staff development and are regarded as resources within the school. In an active role, teachers participate in staff development and presentations of it, but are not regarded as experts by each other. In a passive role teachers listen to lectures or presentations from experts (either inside or outside the school system), usually in a one-shot session where the expert presents information with no modification or adaptation to the school.

Duration - Ongoing staff development is a process where teachers focus on a priority area, set realistic time to learn and become proficient, and practice, follow-up, and feedback are the norm. Intermittent staff development reflects some concerted effort by staff for priority topics. The one-shot usually means a one-time presentation by an expert. These sessions can be well received by teachers as "good" presentations, however, the session has little impact because it is not designed to be sustained so teachers can really learn how to do something new, or have time and support for reflection on the new practice.

Content and pedagogy - In schools "high" on the continuum, staff development links subject area content to pedagogy, links curriculum with instructional approaches. Teachers examine the assumptions of what they are teaching and how they are teaching. For example, cooperative learning is not taught in isolation, but within a content area such as mathematics. Staff development that does not link content with instruction teaches one without the other, with little tie to how or why one fits other into coherent learning or into real classroom situations.

Relation to school improvement plan (SIP) - Staff development is tied to the goals in the plan, i.e., staff development is how some of the goals are reached. In "low" schools where staff development is unlinked to the SIP, the SIP has usually not been developed by the staff, and so there is little ownership or commitment to it.

Role of experts - Teachers see themselves as the source of teaching and learning--they are the experts. Time has usually been provided (restructured day/week) for teachers in the school to discuss/present ideas to other teachers. Team teaching and other innovations such as substitute teachers, are provided during the day for teachers to peer coach, plan, and reflect. In "medium" schools experts are brought in from the outside to present lessons or demonstrations. Outside experts can also provide some ongoing training, working with small groups or individuals. Sometimes the use of experts includes a small number of teachers going to a training in order to become trainers/leaders back in the school. In schools low on the continuum, outside experts talk to teachers, but do not work with teachers in their school in any sustained effort.

Teacher sharing - Teachers make time to formally meet to share what they learned in courses, conferences, or from readings. Teachers also share products from their own teaching such as thematic units. There is free discussion among staff to fine-tune issues of adaptation and implementation. In schools low on the continuum, information about what individual teachers are doing is random or not shared.

Teacher talk - Teachers formally and informally discuss students in particular and in general, in terms of instruction, continually try to better understand how to reach, motivate, and provide greater opportunities for student learning. In "medium" schools teachers do not routinely discuss their teaching and its impact on students. In schools low on the continuum, constructive teacher talk about students is rare. If it happens at all, it is it is by the principal discussing teaching and learning in a top-down style.

TABLE 2. PLANNING, DECISION MAKING, AND USE OF RESOURCES

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
DECISION MAKING	collaborative	hierarchical	decision by default
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN	carefully developed with staff	some staff involved	staff uninvolved
CONSUMERS OF INFORMATION	critical users of information	scattered users of information	information weak, acceptance of anything
USE OF RESOURCES	thoughtful, creative	uneven examination of possibilities	no idea how to use resources differently
RELATIONSHIP WITH RESOURCE PROVIDERS	develops relationships (universities, agencies, businesses)	uneven development with resources	few, if any relationships with resources
TEACHER AS RESOURCE	teacher is expert in the school and other settings	sometimes accepted as expert	behave as though they have no expertise
STAFF TIME	volunteer	paid for time	no time given at all

PLANNING, DECISION MAKING, AND USE OF RESOURCES

Decision making - Decisions for staff development, curriculum and instruction are collaboratively made by the school staff. Group processes are strong. In "medium" schools staff development decisions are made by the traditional hierarchy, i.e., principal and administration, with uneven input from teachers. In "low" schools, staff development decisions are made by default because a deadline is approaching, or a convenient presenter is available.

School Improvement Plan - Teachers tie staff development to the major goals of the school improvement plan. In schools where the SIP has not been developed by the staff, there is little commitment to it and staff development may not be tied to it.

Consumers of staff development - Teachers seek information about the quality of, and research base for, staff development, and examine it for group decision making. Professional materials are a part of everyday school life, with strong support from the principal. In schools medium on the continuum, information about staff development may or may not be tied to research or effective practice. In "low" schools, fads prevail, or anything that is available on days mandated for staff development.

Use of resources - There is a great variance of resources at schools, however the availability of many resources is not as important as how they are used. For example, in "high" schools the resource of time is examined in non-traditional ways and can result in flexible scheduling, extended days and half-days for staff to have time for adult learning. Another example is use of grant monies to hire substitutes for teachers to work with each other, to hire consultants, and to provide stipends for teachers. In schools low on the continuum resources are not approached with a principle of reallocation. In these schools, the spirit of "we can't do that" prevails.

Relationships with resource providers - Schools have variable access to resources providers (grants, corporations, universities, agencies). Principals who worked in the central office have many more staff development resources than those who have not. Those with weak ties to central office reported overbearing regulations regarding resources.

Teacher as resource - Some school staffs believe that they are the experts fully able to manage their professional development. Some have even become experts in other schools and become providers of staff development. In most schools (medium on the continuum) there is a core of teachers who also believe that with support, they could solve some of the problems of teaching and learning. However, in these schools (the overwhelming majority of schools), the core of teachers' ability to motivate the entire staff is weak. In schools low on the continuum the staff does not believe they are capable of professional development without massive infusion of expertise from outside sources.

Staff time - Staff view themselves as professionals and keep "professional hours". They see their job holistically, and salary is attached to "getting the job done". However, most staff in most schools were "medium" on the continuum and wished to be paid for time after the prescribed school day which has been determined by bargaining agreement. The spirit of unionism prevails in terms of time and compensation, and time is seen as inviolate.

TABLE 3. LEADERSHIP AND VISION FOR THE SCHOOL

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
PHILOSOPHY, VISION	clear goals, shared vision	unclear vision, not shared	problems are the vision
ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP	collaborative, collegial, democratic	hierarchical, autocratic, top-down, or "one person show"	laissez-faire vacuum
TEAM BUILDING	LSC, teachers, principal	some coalitions, dissension	conflict, tension
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	teachers are leaders	principal's ideas dominate	anyone's ideas dominate
SENSE OF PROFESSIONALISM	strong, mutual respect	strong in a core group	disconnected, isolated

LEADERSHIP AND VISION FOR SCHOOL

Philosophy and vision - There is a clear philosophy, vision, mission for the school, and it is known and shared by staff, parents, and community. The principal is key in the articulation of the vision, and in some schools able to give it authenticity by the way in which the school community is involved in implementing the vision. In "medium" schools there is a stated vision, but it is not a part of everyday school life. In "low" schools the current pressing problem is the only semblance of a vision.

Organizational leadership - The principal sets the leadership and relationship tone of the school. In "high" schools the principal, teachers, staff, parents and community have established relationships with each other so that they can collaborate on school related matters, each within their role. Principal and teachers have a collegial relationship and democratic process prevails. In schools assessed as "medium" on the continuum, organizational leadership includes some collaboration, with most decisions made hierarchically, by the chain of command, resembling pre-reform practices, or there is a principal who is a leader, but a "one person show", being the engine that drives reform. In schools low on the continuum, there is an absence of leadership and connectedness among the staff, and little evidence of relationship building by the principal.

Team building - The principal sets the tone for team building, is skilled at bringing people together to share a vision and implement a SIP. In most schools which are medium on the continuum, there is some coalition building, but there are also groups that work against each other. In these schools an "in group" can be seen as holding the power, not allowing others to have leadership. In "low" schools conflict and tension prevail, with enormous energy spent on groups fighting each other. In these schools principal is either the contributor to the conflict, or powerless to alter it.

Instructional leadership - In schools high on the continuum, teachers are the instructional leaders of the school, facilitated and supported by the principal who is well experienced in research-based, learner-centered curriculum and instruction. Staff development is ongoing and basic to everyday teaching and learning. In "medium" schools the principal's ideas tend to dominate, and teachers take directions. In these schools, a core of teachers can still prevail with their own professionalism if their ideas fit with the principal's. In "low" schools, anyone's ideas prevail, and teachers teach and develop in any way they please. If any change is initiated, it tends to be the latest fad.

Sense of professionalism - In schools high on the continuum, teachers have a sense of professionalism and self-respect, which is shared among the entire staff. The principal is key in setting this tone. In "medium" schools, there is a core of teachers who honor and guard their professional development as best they can. In "low" schools, the staff is disconnected and isolated and any professionalism resides uncommunicated.

Results

Of the seven schools initially interested in becoming a PDS and in which relationships were developed over the first year, three were "high" to "medium" on most elements on framework, and were "ready" to embark on becoming professional development schools. Four schools were "low" to "medium" on the framework and were deemed unready to become professional development sites. Results of the first year of assessing readiness are described below.

Ready Schools

Schools A and B: Two schools with the greatest potential for becoming professional development schools had principals with a vision of what reform is and a good idea of how much effort would be needed. They understand there is no quick fix; they believe teachers are the key to learner-centered teaching. Because of this, they are indefatigable in their efforts to engage teachers in decision making and professional development. Teachers in these schools run the gamut--most are tireless, ready to be mentors to novices, continually involved in professional development; a few are angry, defensive, and beaten by the school system. Yet, because of these principals and the strong core of teachers ready for reform, expending resources to build professional development schools makes sense.

School A: School A was a Partnership School, and was "medium" on most staff development elements, but was poised to move into "high" on the nature of staff development activities. The teachers were being involved by the principal in planning, decision making as she tried to use resources wisely. The vision was clear to the principal and to some teachers. Overall, staff were interested in giving of their time and in participating in the development of the PDS model as it might fit their school.

. Demographic characteristics included School A being a small school, racially integrated, serving children in and out of the neighborhood, with students who were mostly middle class with parents highly involved in the school.

School B: School B was not a Partnership school, was "medium" on staff development, and

the principal was trying to develop more stable relationships with resource providers. This factor added to the much needed resources of the school, but also served to create a "cafeteria" atmosphere of resources which bordered on confusion. In terms of empowering teachers, this principal tended to be the idea source, and many of the teachers believed she had her mind made up already, and the vision of the school had to be her vision. Work was needed to develop staff trust so that teachers could feel they were part of decisions. This was an interesting phenomenon, because the school had some of the most talented teachers in the school system. Overall, the school holds promise, mostly because of its talented staff and the progress that has been made in creating a nurturant environment for children in an otherwise hostile community.

. Demographic characteristics included School B being large, overcrowded, ethnically isolated, pre-school-6 grade, with children from families new to the community and to the United States. Poverty was serious, as were immigration problems.

School C: School C was not a Partnership school, but was a high school in which many of the university's student teachers were placed. Staff development was "high to low" at this school, with individual departments operating independently and very differently from each other. The school had a longstanding relationship with another university best characterized as unequal and uneven, and the principal and teachers wished to proceed slowly to ensure that the partnership would be of mutual benefit. During the first year this school took on the practitioner role in connecting both the College of Arts and Science and the College of Education. Because the principal is retiring, the future of continued PDS development is uncertain. If however, the new principal is interested, PDS development will proceed.

. Demographics of this school include its being a "feeder" school for School A, with some racial diversity (80% African American students), and it has a reputation of being a good school that prepares many students for college.

Schools Not Ready

School D: School D was a Partnership school and was "medium to low" on staff development. While the principal encouraged teachers to volunteer for staff development (he used school funds to pay teachers at their hourly rate), it became clear over the year that the principal was unable to allow teachers to make decisions about their development. As part of another education partnership project, this school was involved in sustained, facilitated sessions which were intended to improve the principal-staff relationship; the outcome was not successful. As the year progressed, it became obvious that the principal was interested in all the resources he could get from any provider, and that these efforts were mostly for show (he was seeking a position at a large high school). Teachers agreed that the school vision pleased the parents' need for control and safety, but that the domination of the principal over them was oppressive. By the end of the year, it was determined that this school was not ready to become a professional development site.

. Demographics included School D being racially isolated, in a deteriorating neighborhood with gang and drug problems.

School E: School E was a Partnership school and was "low to medium" on staff development. The principal had participated in the University Partnership activities, but the teachers had not. The principal was interested in more staff development resources for the school and brought together a core group of interested teachers to consider PDS. These teachers seemed to be a part of decisions, and the vision they shared with the principal was to make the school better. Over the year, barriers became evident, such the geographic isolation of the school, and the need for particular programming that the university was unable to offer on site, e.g., a few teachers wanted ESL training at their building, but the university was only able to provide ESL resources as part of other programs which were conducted on campus. When the principal moved to another school at the end of the year, there was no impetus for sustaining this weak relationship.

. Demographics of the school included it being ethnically and geographically isolated. The area had been the center of the steel industry, but now had a high unemployment rate and a ethnically changing population.

School F: School F was not a Partnership school and was "low to medium" on the nature of staff development activities. An unusual feature was that the principal assigned a teacher to coordinate the project saying he really preferred to stay directly out of it. The PDS Director decided to work with this condition, although the immediate reaction was to judge the lack of principal leadership as untenable. In the first few months, a core of twelve teachers showed real commitment to addressing the language arts curriculum and devoted their own time on professional development activities. However, as the year progressed, decisions about minor details became barriers (such as use of the building for meetings). With the principal uninvolved, the relationship was only sustained by the efforts of the PDS Director. It became clear that while the principal allowed teachers to participate, his lack of leadership and involvement prohibited sustained effort.

. Demographics of school F included it being an ethnically mixed school, with an overwhelming gang problem, poverty, and drugs.

School G: School G was not a Partnership school, but was a school in which student teachers had been placed over the years. The school was medium to low on staff development, and the principal seemed to involve teachers in planning and decision making. The principal's vision for the school was to build a sense of community, which was a direct response to the fact that the school did not serve neighborhood children. Those children went to another school close by which was thought by the community to be better. Historically, the school had become a place for special needs students. Over the year, as teachers and especially the principal learned about the nature of commitment to a PDS, interest waned. It seemed that the traditional relationship with a university--placing student teachers in the school, but not really engaging them in the life of the school--was preferable.

. Demographics for this school included its being located in a gentrified section of the city, however, neighborhood children attended magnet schools or private schools. Students in the school were bused from other communities which tended to create a sense of detachment, and made tackling problems difficult.

Conclusions

As a result of the first year of work, it was judged that two of the seven schools were on the way to becoming professional development schools--schools A and B. A third school, School C, the high school, was moving slower, and with focused resources and support, has the potential to be a professional development site. The other four schools for various reasons described above, were at a developmental level which required substantially greater resources than this project or the university have at the present time.

What were the common factors across schools that led to PDS selection? It appears that at least a "medium" readiness, as assessed by the three-part framework developed by Hyde, Koerner, and Daly Lewis (1991) was necessary. Schools A and B were well rated on the three factors. For School C, ratings were high to low, given the nature of high schools, and it is less clear what the level of resources are needed to go forward. Schools low on most elements were clearly not ready, as was seen in the remaining four schools, D through G.

Being a member of the Education Partnership did not seem to influence readiness--one school in the Partnership was ready, and three were not. Membership in the Partnership was most often initiated by the university, and it may be that some schools are drawn to a partnership with a university to solve intractable problems. Given the resources currently available to the PDS concept--no extra staff following the foundation funding for start-up--some schools appear to be poor risks, that is, their chance for sustained improvement would be minimal, at best. Demographic characteristics within the schools were also inconclusive, however, that three of the four non-selected schools are in high poverty areas with gang and drug problems is telling. In these schools, the myriad social problems seem too overwhelming

for the available resources that were dedicated to counter these forces.

In general, the schools that were deemed "ready" were schools that were working reasonably well already, and were disposed to deepen the relationship that had been started with the university. Of the seven schools that were worked with during this initial year, two, perhaps three schools exhibited readiness for PDS. These schools showed a readiness to participate in long-term staff development of their own design, participate in decision making and all of its thorniness, and take on leadership of classroom matters.

Schools Not Ready: Triage

The data from this study suggests that all schools do not have the potential to become professional development schools, at least as assessed at a particular point in time using the framework which determined readiness on the three factors, and the resources available.

When a school is deemed "not ready" as determined by a university, what are some implications? From our work we have learned that with prevailing resources, some schools should not be selected. This suggests a *triage* way of thinking about schools. While this judgement is stark, this study found evidence that conditions in some schools are such that resources available for a viable university-school partnership may be insufficient to developing quality PDS sites. This is important to realize upfront so that participants do not feel exploited, by having hope raised then dashed, repeating a cycle of failure when trying to collaborate.

Implications and Discussion

In ventures that attempt to forge different kinds of relationships that lead to positive change, one must ask the question: What of significance has occurred as a result of the effort? Looking at implications involves more than speculating on the possible benefits; it requires revisiting goals and assumptions.

PDS's are being developed in order to improve the education of youth--a concept built upon the assumption that teacher education programs and teachers in schools can have common educational goals for children, that these goals are not currently being reached at an adequate

level, and that these goals may indeed be reached by combining the intellect, experience, commitment and drive that exists within both professional groups.

Even within the short timespan of this project, approximately one year, much can be shared. Probably the most significant finding thus far has to do with the concept of readiness, particularly as it relates to resources.

Policy Issues Regarding Resources

A number of policy issues regarding resources can be raised as PDS are created. It is generally accepted that some additional resources can act as a catalyst to create lasting benefit. In this project, reality dictated that resources--time, human, and monetary--were finite. Thus, the thorny questions are: What amount of resources are required for success, for sustained change, for reaching the goals we set? Or, to change the emphasis, what are the realistic expectations for improvement?

The instrument piloted in this study for determining school readiness for the PDS approach has the potential for addressing in a more objective way and with greater predictability, these two important questions. It presents to both schools and universities an efficient and participatory vehicle for assessing the capacity for collaboration, before expectations get raised beyond what can be met. It provides criteria and rationale for making commitment to a collaboration that is based on more than mutual good will. For these reasons it deserves further attention and testing.

The resource question, as we move to the next phase of PDS development, has begun to be explored through contacts with other colleges of education also working on professional development schools as part of a growing effort to improve teacher education. It is clear that there is great variance of resources available to develop PDS sites. One university planned for three years before piloting its first school. Another university has been working in about five schools, using about 20 university staff per week in professional development schools. Another university has two professional development schools and one of these has had a relationship

with the university for almost twenty years.

These examples show the magnitude and range of the resources applied to the concept. Perhaps the most significant is time--professional development schools require a great deal of time, an expensive resource. Thus, as the foundation funding for the PDS concludes, and as we continue at Roosevelt to try to institutionalize the professional development school concept, and we must answer for ourselves the resource questions. What will it take to sustain impact and change? Can we make this determination? If yes, are there resources available to maintain PDS's?

Faculty Load as Resource: An idea which holds promise is building the work of PDS into normal faculty load in the teacher preparation program. An experiment underway has one faculty assigned to a PDS who then works with at least five student teachers and up to fifteen prestudent teachers who are clustered at that school for varying periods during a semester. This enables that faculty member to conduct activities related to both preservice and experienced teachers at the school. Next term there are plans to proliferate this model in two more sites in order to better assess the feasibility of reallocating faculty load with different faculty members.

Collaborating with Other Universities: Another idea to address the resource question is to determine how existing resources can be reallocated to create quality sites by stretching resources across universities. A project underway is a collaboration with another university in which side-by-side efforts will be developed in schools, which has the potential to augment the resources of any one institution.

How Many PDS Sites? How many professional development schools are needed to impact a teacher training program? It appears more than two or three are needed if the goal of improving teacher education are to be met. During the second year of this project , other ways to select schools are being examined. Some suburban schools are being considered, using the same PDS concept as in the city schools. Also, schools in which Roosevelt Ed.D. candidates are

principals hold promise. In these schools, there will likely be a ready fit between the principal and the university, at least at the knowledge base and collaboration level.

• • • •

As the PDS continues, it is clear that our efforts in augmenting field experiences for students, modeling multiple instructional practices in our university classes, and placing students in supportive school settings, have great potential in supporting teachers who know how to create learner-centered classrooms. However, it remains to be seen the extent of durability of the PDS model. With no major new and permanent resources available to universities, reallocation of current resources becomes the alternative. We must see if resources used differently will be sufficient to sustain efforts over time. However, with continued examination of PDS efforts, we will learn the level at which PDS schools can reach the goals set by the Holmes Group, the impact PDS can have on large numbers of urban schools with tremendous need, and the effects of dramatically changing teacher education.

NOTE 1: Foundation support included a half-time director and about $25,000 each of two years for stipends and materials to implement: 1) the PDS, 2) curriculum development, and 3) a First Year Teacher Support Group.

REFERENCES

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII, Implementing and sustaining innovations.* Santa Monica, CA.: Rand Corporation.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: MacMillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fullan, M.G. (1990). Staff Development, Innovation, and institutional development. In *Changing school culture through staff development.* 1990 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M.G. (1982). *The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.*

Hyde, A., Koerner, M. and Daly Lewis, M. (1991). Unlocking staff development in Chicago Public Schools. Unpublished Paper funded by and presented to the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, Chicago Public Schools.

Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., Holubec, E.J., and Roy, P. (1988). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.*

Joyce, B., Showers, B., and Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1987). Staff development and student learning: A synthesis of Research on models of teaching. *Educational Leadership,* 45, 3, 77-87.

Kennedy, M.M. (1991). Some surprising findings on how teachers learn to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 49, 3, 14-17.

Knowledge Base for the Roosevelt University College of Education (1991). Chicago, IL: Roosevelt University.

Leinhardt, F. (1992). What research on learning tells us about teaching. *Educational Leadership*. 49, 7, 20-25.

Lieberman, A. (1986). *Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Miles, M. and Huberman, M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Schon, D. (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Yinger, R. (1986). Learning the language of practice: Implications for beginning year of teaching programs. In Griffin, G. & Millies, S. (Eds.), *The first years of teaching: Background papers and a proposal.* Illinois State Board of Education Publication, 65-89.